UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,123	01/12/2004	Ralf Gutsche	HSJ920030256US1	3143

7590   11/02/2006

John L. Rogitz
Rogitz & Associates
Suite 3120
750 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101

EXAMINER
CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 August 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19 and 21-25* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19 and 21-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Claims 1-19,21-25 are pending in this application.

2.   Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 8/17/2006.

3.   Claims, 1,10-11,19,21-25 have been amended [8/17/2006].

4.   Claim 20 has been cancelled [8/17/2006].

Drawings

5.   The Drawings filed on 1/12/2004 are <u>acceptable</u> for examination purpose.

Information Disclosure Statement

6.   The information disclosure statement filed on 09/13/2006 is in compliance with the

provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, and has been considered and a copy enclosed with this

office action.

7.   The information disclosure statement filed on 1/12/2004 is in compliance with the

provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, and has been considered and a copy was mailed on

08/09/2006

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

As set forth in MPEP 2106(II)A:

Identify and understand Any Practical Application Asserted for the Invention The claimed

invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful,

concrete and tangible result." State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47USPQ2d at 1601-02. The

purpose of this requirement is to limit patent protection to

inventions that possess a certain level of "real world" value, as opposed to subject matter that

represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting point for future

investigation or research (Brenner v. Manson, 383 U.S. 519, 528-36, 148 USPQ 689, 693-96);

In re Ziegler, 992, F.2d 1197, 1200-03, 26 USPQ2d 1600,

1603-06 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Accordingly, a complete disclosure should contain some

indication of the <u>practical application</u> for the claimed invention, i.e., why the applicant

believes the claimed invention is useful.

Apart from the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101, usefulness under the patent eligibility

standard requires significant functionality to be present to satisfy the useful result aspect of the

practical application requirement. See Arrhythmia, 958 F.2d at 1057, 22 USPQ2d at 1036.

*Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material <u>**stored in a computer-readable medium does**</u>*

*<u>**not make the invention eligible for patenting**</u>. For example, a claim directed to a word*

*processing <u>**file stored on a disk may satisfy the utility**</u> requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101 since the*

*information stored may have some <u>**"real world"**</u> value. However, the mere fact that the claim*

may satisfy the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101 **does not mean that a useful result is**

achieved under the practical application requirement. <u>**The claimed invention as a whole must**</u>

<u>**produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result to have a practical application**</u>.

8.   Regarding claim 1, *"A graphical user interface (GUI) for configuring pipelines, the*

GUI displayable on a user computer monitor and stored on a computer memory and

comprising: at least one pipe input set window configured to permit a user to define

a type of pipe input set data; at least one GUI page based on the type, the GUI page

being generated by translating the type using a configuration file to a class and using

Java reflection to generate an instance of the class, the instance producing the GUI

page" is directed to "abstract idea" because all of the elements in the claim 1 would

reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in light of the disclosure particularly

pages 1-26 as software code, such that the graphical user interface (GUI) for

configuring pipelines is software, per se , is "non-statutory subject matter" and ***claim 1***

do not have "practical application" because the "final result" by the claimed invention in

the claim 1 elements particularly "at least one GUI page based on the type, the GUI

page being generated by translating the type using a configuration file to a class and

using Java reflection to generate an instance of the class, the instance producing the

GUI page" is not producing "useful, tangible and concrete" and therefore, claim 1 is a

non-statutory subject matter, is merely software code or algorithm, is not producing

"useful, tangible and concrete" and therefore, claim 1 is a non-statutory subject

matter[see Interim Guidelines page 55-57].

The claimed invention is subject to the test of State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74,
47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. Specifically State Street sets forth that the claimed invention
must produce a *"useful, concrete and tangible result."* The **Interim Guidelines for
Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility** states in
section IV C. 2 b. (2) (on page 21 in the PDF format):

> The tangible requirement does not necessarily mean that a claim must either be
> tied to a particular machine or apparatus or must operate to change articles or
> materials to a different state or thing. However, the tangible requirement does
> require that the claim must recite more than a § 101 judicial exception, in that the
> process claim must set forth a practical application of that § 101 judicial
> exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ
> at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical
> application.").

[If] Claim 1 have the result of producing results related to "at least one GUI page
based on the type, the GUI page being generated by translating the type using a
configuration file to a class and using Java reflection to generate an instance of the
class, the instance producing the GUI page" however the claim limitation[s] does not
output useful, concrete result.

The claims 1-9 dependent from claim 1 is also rejected in the above analysis.

9.   Regarding claim 10, "A computer system including graphical user interface (GUI)
for a pipeline architecture, the GUI being stored on a computer-readable medium,
comprising: means for generating and modifying pipelines without writing any JAVA
code apart from an initial core code" is directed to "abstract idea" because all of the

elements in the claim 1 would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in light

of the disclosure particularly pages 1-26 as software code, or routines based on

software modules such that the graphical user interface (GUI) for configuring pipelines

is software, per se , is "non-statutory subject matter" and *claim 10* do not have

"practical application" because the "final result" by the claimed invention in the claim 10

particularly "means for determining, based on parameters of the means for determining,

whether a first tuple in a data store is required for processing, and if so, processing the

tuple and otherwise not processing the tuple, wherein in the event that the means for

determining requires additional data, the means for determining requests a tuple

specifying required content/condition" elements is not producing', useful, and concrete"

and therefore, claim 10 is a non-statutory subject matter.

The claimed invention is subject to the test of State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74,

47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. Specifically State Street sets forth that the claimed invention

must produce a *"useful, concrete and tangible result."* The **Interim Guidelines for**

Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility states in

section IV C. 2 b. (2) (on page 21 in the PDF format):

> The tangible requirement does not necessarily mean that a claim must either be
> tied to a particular machine or apparatus or must operate to change articles or
> materials to a different state or thing. However, the tangible requirement does
> require that the claim must recite more than a § 101 judicial exception, in that the
> process claim must set forth a practical application of that § 101 judicial
> exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ
> at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical
> application.").

The examiner reviewed the specification pages 1-26 but was unable to find a

practical real-world use of the result (***means for determining, based on parameters***

of the means for determining, whether a first tuple in a data store is required for

processing, and if so, processing the tuple and otherwise not processing the

tuple, wherein in the event that the means for determining requires additional

data, the means for determining requests a tuple specifying required

content/condition" elements is not producing"). If the applicant is able to find one

and inserts it into the claims provide the location the element is found in the

· specification.

The claims 11-18 dependent from claim 10 is also rejected in the above analysis.

10.   Regarding claim 19, " A computer-implemented method for generating a pipeline

for processing data from at least one data store stored in a computer storage,

comprising: presenting a main GUI window; using the main GUI window to access an

initial core code; using the main GUI window to access at least one subsequent GUI

window; and using the at least one subsequent GUI window to configure the pipeline at

least in part" is directed to "abstract idea" because all of the elements in the claim 19

would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in light of the disclosure

particularly pages 1-26 as software code, or software routines such that the generating

a pipeline for processing data is software, per se , is "non-statutory subject matter" and

claim 19 do not have "practical application" because the "final result" by the claimed

invention in the claim 19 elements particularly 'using the main GUI window to access at least one subsequent GUI window; and using the at least one subsequent GUI window to configure the pipeline at least in part, wherein the main GUI window is at lest one pipe input set window configured to permit a user to define a type of pipe input set data, at least one GUI page based on the type being configurable" is not producing "useful, and concrete" and therefore, claim 19 is a non-statutory subject matter.

The examiner reviewed the specification pages 1-26 but was unable to find a practical real-world use of the result (*using the main GUI window to access at least one subsequent GUI window; and using the at least one subsequent GUI window to configure the pipeline at least in part, wherein the main GUI window is at lest one pipe input set window configured to permit a user to define a type of pipe input set data, at least one GUI page based on the type being configurable"*). If the applicant is able to find one and inserts it into the claims provide the location the element is found in the specification.

The claims 21-25 dependent from claim 19 is also rejected in the above analysis.

It is further noted that there is no full description or details regarding hardware or physical media, but merely suggests fig 1, data store contains raw data records and pipeline communicates with the processing modules...[spec page 6]

As to claim 10, the preamble as amended [8/17/2006]is directed to "A computer-system including a graphical user interface (GUI) for a pipeline architecture, the GUI being stored on a computer-readable medium" however, it is noted that ***specification does not teach "computer-readable medium***" of any kind including <u>drawing fig 1- 21.</u> although fig 1, merely, showing element 16 pipemodule 1...M processing, element 18 is storage ... Therefore, claim 10-17 does not have "***computer-readable medium***" support from the specification.

As to claim 1,19 the preamble as amended [8/17/2006] computer memory,.. [claim 1], stored in a computer storage....[claim 19], however, it is noted that ***specification does not have support "computer memory"; "computer storage"***

For "General Analysis for Determining Patent-Eligible Subject Matter", see 101 Interim Guidelines as indicated below:

<<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/ogsheet.html>>

No new matter should be entered

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

12.   Claims 1,10, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

13.   As to claim 1, the preamble reads "A graphical user interface (GUI) for configuring pipelines, the GUI displayable on a user computer monitor and stored on a computer memory.... "computer memory" is neither described, nor have support from the specification, although fig 1 merely suggests various modules but not any hardware.

14.   As to claim 10, the preamble reads "a computer system including a graphical user interface (GUI) for a pipeline architecture, the GUI being stored on a computer-readable medium" "computer-medium" is neither described, nor have support from the specification, although fig 1, merely suggests various modules for example "pipemodule mean 1.....along with other elements.

15.   As to claim 19, the preamble reads "A computer-implemented method for

generating a pipeline for processing data from at least one data store stored in a

computer storage", it is noted that "computer storage" is neither defined nor have

support from the specification, although fig 1 merely suggests various modules but not

hardware

16.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

17.   As to claim 1,10,19, it is unclear what is meant by "computer memory",

"computer-readable medium" and "computer storage", although fig 1, page 6 merely

suggests various modules, but not having support for computer memory, computer

readable medium and like.

18.   It is not clear whether all or part of the claim 11-17 functional or non-functional

language because claim 10 is specifically directed to "means........" and claim 18

depend from claim 10 is also directed to "means for....."

        Appropriate correction is required in response to this office action

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

19.   *Claims 1-9, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over*

Drawschwandtner *et al. [hereafter* **Drawschwandtner]***, US Publication No. 20030210275*

published on Nov. 13,2003 in view of Broussard et al. [hereafter Broussard], US Pub.

No. 2003/0159130

20.   As to claim 1, Drawschwandtner teaches a system which including 'A graphical

user interface (GUI) for configuring pipelines' [see Abstract, fig 2, page 1, 0011],

graphical user interface corresponds to Drawschwandtner's fig 2; pipelines corresponds

to software modules generated for specific applications using software tools as detailed

in page 1,   col 2, 0011; the GUI displayable on a user computer monitor and stored on

a computer memory' [fig 2] and comprising: at least one pipe input set window

configured to permit-a user to define a type of pipe input set data' [page 2, col 1, 0017,

line 1-5, page 2, col 2, 0020], Drawschwandtner specifically teaches menu GUI menu

allows command line options that allows users to define input as detailed in page 2, col

2, 0020 ; at least one GUI page based on the type, the GUI page being generated by

translating the type using a configuration file to a class [page 6, col 1, line 1-3],

Drawschwandtner specifically teaches GUI module configured to generate user's

selection of commands and using 'the instance producing the GUI page' [page 3, col 1,

0025]. It is however, noted that Drawschwandtner does not specifically teaches 'Java

reflection', although Drawschwandtner specifically teaches C and C++ language

structure [page 2, col 1, 0018]   On the other hand, Broussard disclosed Java reflection'

[see Abstract, page 1, col 1, 0007], Broussard specifically teaches Java reflection API

calls in software development.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Broussard et al. into extensible

command-line description mechanism for activating external tools of Drawschwandtner

because both Drawschwandtner and Broussard are specifically directed to software

development particularly generating software modules [see Broussard: page 3,

col 2, 0040-0041; Drawschwandtner: page 1, col 2, 0010], and both Broussard,

Drawschwandtner specifically teaches "user interface or GUI used for various

commands [see Broussard: fig 1, Drawschwandtner" fig 2, Abstract], and both

Broussard, Drawschwandtner suggests C++ software modules [see Broussard:

page 4, col 2, 0052, line 6-11; Drawschwandtner: page 2, col 1, 0018, line 2-7]

and both specifically teach creating software modules using user interface.

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to

incorporate the teachings of Broussard et al. into extensible command-line description

mechanism for activating external tools of Drawschwandtner because that would have

allowed users of Drawschwandtner to implement Java objects, particularly Java

reflection API using software development wizard, further as the flexibility to manipulate

Java classes, i.e., manipulating properties for example Java class to obtain the names

of all its members and display them while it is not possible in typical C or C++,

therefore, improving software applications useful in programming environment

[page 1, 0015-0016].

21.   As to claim 2, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein at least the pipe input set

window and GUI page require no programming apart from an initial core code'

[page 3, col 1, 0023].

22.   As to claim 3, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein the GUI is an incremental

GUI wherein GUI pages for new pipe components can be added incrementally without

changing existing code' [page 4, col 2, 0037].

23.   As to claim 4, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein at least one new pipe

module is based on a pre-existing module type' [page 4, col 2, 0035].

24.   As to claim 5, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein at least one new pipe

module is based on a new user-defined component type' [page 5, col 1, 0039,

line 13-20].

25.   As to claim 6, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein the GUI defines a set of

interfaces, each interface including plural functions' [page 2, col 1, 0017, line 1-5], the

GUI including a GUI representation part and a storage part, the GUI representation part

defining how something is displayed and the storage part defining how GUI parameters

are stored in an external storage' [page 2, col 2, 0020].

26.   As to claim 7, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'at least one Pipe Output Set tab for

defining PipeOutputSet representative of a type of output data from the pipeline'

[page 4, col 1, 0031].

27.   As to claim 8, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'at least one Storage For TupleSets

tab for defining an arbitrary number of elements contained in a StorageForTupleSets

component of the pipeline, individual input and output sets being definable for each

element in the component' [page 3, 0025, page 4, 0036, fig 2].

28.   As to claim 9, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'at least one Pipe Modules tab for

defining an arbitrary number of PipeModules of the pipeline, a type being selected for

each PipeModule using the tab, the type defining at least in part the GUI' [page 4,

0035].

29.   *Claims 10-19, 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over*

Drawschwandtner et al. [hereafter Drawschwandtner], US Pub No. 2003/0210275 published

on Nov 13, 2003 in view of Simonoff et al. [hereafter Simonoff], US Patent No. 6054983

30.   As to claim 10, Drawschwandtner teaches a system which including 'means for

generating and modifying Pipelines without writing any JAVA code apart from an initial

core code' [Abstract, page 4, col 1, 0032, fig 2], Drawschwandtner specifically teaches

software tool particularly commands and options are selected from the graphical user

interface menu as detailed in fig 2, further it is noted that software modules are

developed using C++, or C compiler languages [page 2, 0018, col 2, line 2-6], pipelines

corresponds to software modules as detailed in Abstract., although Drawschwandtner

suggests generator module and interface module that constructs "code" usable for

specific operations [page 4, col 2, 0035].

It is however, noted that Drawschwandtner does not specifically suggest "means

for determining, based on parameters of the means for determining, whether a first tuple

in a data store is required for processing, and if so, processing the tuple and otherwise

not processing the tuple, wherein in the event that the means for determining requires

additional data the means for determining requests a tuple specifying required

content/condition'. On the other hand, Simonoff disclosed means for determining,

based on parameters of the means for determining, whether a first tuple in a data store

is required for processing [col 13, line 33-41], and if so, processing the tuple and

otherwise not processing the tuple, wherein in the event that the means for determining

requires additional data the means for determining requests a tuple specifying required

content/condition [col 13, line 50-63].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Simonoff into extensible command-

line description mechanism for activating external tools of Draschwandtner et al.

because both Draschwandtner and Simonoff are directed to GUI related modules, more

specifically, Drawschwandtner teaches "user interface or GUI used for various

commands [see Broussard: fig 1, Drawschwandtner" fig 2, Abstract], while Simonoff

suggests GUI script defining the GUI on both server, network protocols, and

communication between server and client computers [see Abstract, col 14, line 17-26]

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to

incorporate the teachings of Simonoff into extensible command-line description

mechanism for activating external tools of Draschwandtner et al. because that would

have allowed users of Draschwandtner to use GUIScript message and to the application

servers that requires to determining the data and conditions that is suitable for

application running on the server computer, subsequently used by the universal devices

in generating a refreshed GUI as suggested by Simonoff [col 13, line 59-63], bringing

the advantages of computer architecture that is independent of generating and

displaying a graphic user interface on client computer connected to a server computer

particularly storing scripts that defining respective GUI objects as suggested by

Simonoff [col 5, line 50-63].

31.   As to claim 11, Drawschwandtner disclosed at least one pipe input set window

configured to permit-a user to define a type of pipe input set data' [page 2, col 1, 0017,

line 1-5, page 2, col 2, 0020], Drawschwandtner specifically teaches menu GUI menu

allows command line options that allows users to define input as detailed in page 2,

col 2, 0020 ; at least one GUI page based on the type, the GUI page being generated

by translating the type using a configuration file to a class [page 6, col 1, line 1-3],

Drawschwandtner specifically teaches GUI module configured to generate user's

selection of commands and using 'the instance producing the GUI page' [page 3, col 1,

0025]. It is however, noted that Drawschwandtner does ot specifically teaches 'Java

reflection', although Drawschwandtner specifically teaches C and C++ language

structure [page 2, col 1, 0018]

32.   As to claim 12, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein at least the pipe input set

window and GUI page require no programming apart from an initial core code' [page 3,

col 1, 0023].

33.   As to claim 13, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein the GUI is an incremental

GUI wherein GUI pages for new pipe components can be added incrementally without

changing existing code' [page 4, col 2, 0037].

34.   As to claim 14, 22, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'wherein the GUI defines a set of

interfaces, each interface including plural functions' [page 2, col 1, 0017, line 1-5], the

GUI including a GUI representation part and a storage part, the GUI representation part

defining how something is displayed and the storage part defining how GUI parameters

are stored in an external storage' [page 2, col 2, 0020].

35.   As to claim 15, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'at least one Pipe Output Set tab for

defining PipeOutputSet representative of a type of output data from the pipeline'

[page 4, col 1, 0031].

36.   As to claim 16, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'at least one Storage For TupleSets

tab for defining an arbitrary number of elements contained in a StorageForTupleSets

component of the pipeline, individual input and output sets being definable for each

element in the component' [page 3, 0025, page 4, 0036, fig 2].

37.   As to claim 17, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'at least one Pipe Modules tab for

defining an arbitrary number of PipeModules of the pipeline, a type being selected for

each PipeModule using the tab, the type defining at least in part the GUI' [page 4,

0035].

38.   As to claim 18, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'means for making available new

pipeline module types without writing any JAVA code apart from an initial core code'

[page 5, col 1, 0038, line 1-8, 0039].

39.   As to claim 19, Drawschwandtner teaches a system which including 'presenting a

main GUI window' [fig 2, page 4, 0038, line 1-2], Drawschwandtner specifically teaches

user interface or GUI as detailed in fig 2;

       'using the main GUI window to access an initial core code' page 4, col 2, 0037,

fig 2];

       'using the main GUI window to access at least one subsequent GUI

window' [page 5, col 1, 0041];

       using the at least one subsequent GUI window to configure the pipeline at least

in part' [page 5, col 2, 0042],., although Drawschwandtner suggests generator module

and interface module that constructs "code" usable for specific operations [page 4, col

2, 0035], 'main GUI window is at least one pipe input set window configured to permit a

user to define' [Abstract, page 2, col 1, 0017, line 1-10] pipelines corresponds to

software modules as detailed in Abstract.

       It is however, noted that Drawschwandtner does not specifically teach " at least

one GUI page based on the type being configurable'. On the other hand, Simonoff

disclosed 'at least one GUI page based on the type being configurable ' [see Abstract,

col 11, line 8-20].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Simonoff into extensible command-line description mechanism for activating external tools of Draschwandtner et al. because both Draschwandtner and Simonoff are directed to GUI related modules, more specifically, Drawschwandtner teaches "user interface or GUI used for various commands [see Broussard: fig 1, Drawschwandtner" fig 2, Abstract], while Simonoff suggests GUI script defining the GUI on both server, network protocols, and communication between server and client computers [see Abstract, col 14, line 17-26]

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Simonoff into extensible command-line description mechanism for activating external tools of Draschwandtner et al. because that would have allowed users of Draschwandtner to use GUIScript message and to the application servers that requires to determining the data and conditions that is suitable for application running on the server computer, subsequently used by the universal devices in generating a refreshed GUI as suggested by Simonoff [col 13, line 59-63], bringing the advantages of computer architecture that is independent of generating and displaying a graphic user interface on client computer connected to a server computer particularly storing scripts that defining respective GUI objects as suggested by Simonoff [col 5, line 50-63].

40.   As to claim 21, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'generating the GUI page by

translating the type using a configuration file to a class' [page 1, col 2, 0010];

'using Java reflection to generate an instance of the class, 'the instance producing

the GUI page' [fig 2]. It is however, noted that Drawschwandtner does not specifically

teaches 'Java reflection', although Drawschwandtner specifically teaches C and C++

language structure [page 2, col 1, 0018] . On the other hand, Simonoff disclosed 'Java

Reflections" [col 10, line 65-67, col 13, line 6-10].

41.   As to claim 23, Drawschwandtner disclosed 'defining a representative of a type of

output data from the pipeline' [page 3, 0023].

42.   As to claim 24-25, Drawschwandtner defining an arbitrary number of elements

contained in a component of the pipeline, individual input and output sets being

definable for each element in the component' [page 3, 0023-0024].

Response to Arguments

43.   Applicant's arguments filed on 8/17/2006 with respect to claims 1-19,21-25 have

been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response, see

discussion below:

a)   Claims 1-19,21-25 have been rejected under 35 USC 101 because there is no

full description or details regarding hardware or physical media, but merely suggests

fig 1 data store contains raw data records and pipeline communicates with the

processing modules...[spec page 6]

As to claim 10, the preamble as amended [8/17/2006]is directed to "A computer-

system including a graphical user interface (GUI) for a pipeline architecture, the GUI

being stored on a computer-readable medium" however, it is noted that ***specification***

does not teach "computer-readable medium" of any kind including <u>drawing fig 1- 21.</u>

although fig 1, merely, showing element 16 pipemodule 1...M processing, element 18 is

storage ... Therefore, claim 10-17 does not have "***computer-readable medium***"

support from the specification.

As to claim 1,19 the preamble as amended [8/17/2006] computer memory,..

[claim 1], stored in a computer storage....[claim 19], however, it is noted that

specification does not have support "computer memory"; "computer storage

Therefore, applicant's remarks at page 9 are deemed not to be persuasive, and

claims 1-19,21-25 are rejected under 35 USC 101.

b)   In accordance with applicant's arguments at page 9-10, claim 10, In view of

applicant's amendment to claim 10, examiner rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Drawschwandtner et al. [US Pub No. 2003/0210275 published

on Nov 13, 2003 in view of Simonoff et al, US Patent No. 6054983 as detailed above.

c)   At page 10, claim 19, applicant argues that "applicant notes that the examiner

has not provided a claim construction for "data type" to aid applicant in understand the

basis of the rejection...

As to the above argument [c], as best understood by the examiner, programming

languages such as C or C++[Draschwandtner et al. page 2, col 2, 0018, line 4, page 3,

col 2, line 4], require the programmer to declare the data type of every data object, and

most systems require the user to specify the type of each data field, further the

available data types vary from one programming language to another, and from one

application to another at least fundamental aspect of data type, therefore, "data type" is

integral part of at least Draschwandtner and Simonoff because both are specifically

suggests "programming languages" [Simonoff: col 2, line 42-46, Java programming

language], furthermore, it is noted that pipe input set window configured to permit a user

to define' [Abstract, page 2, col 1, 0017, line 1-10] pipelines corresponds to software

modules as detailed in Abstract.

d)   At page 11, claim 1, applicant argues that "paragraph 25 teaches that Java

reflection can be used to generate GUIs in what appears to be an object-oriented

programming (OOP) environment, ref(a) does not appear to be such an environment.

e)   At page 11, claim 1, applicant argues that it does not appear in the relied upon

sections of ref(b) that Java reflection is used to undertake the specific task recited in

claim 1....

As to the above argument [d-e], it is noted that Drawschwandtner does not

specifically teaches 'Java reflection', although Drawschwandtner specifically teaches C

and C++ language structure [page 2, col 1, 0018] . On the other hand, Broussard

disclosed Java reflection' [see Abstract, page 1, col 1, 0007], Broussard specifically

teaches Java reflection API calls in software development. As best understood by the

examiner, Java Reflection is a feature in the Java programming language, it allows an

executing Java program "introspect" upon itself, and manipulate internal properties of

the program, for example, it's possible for a Java class to obtain the names of all its

members and display them, furthermore, the ability to examine and manipulate a Java

class from within itself while other programming languages such as Pascal, C, or C++

this feature simply doesn't exist., therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of

Broussard et al. into extensible command-line description mechanism for activating

external tools of Drawschwandtner et al. because that would have allowed users of

Drawschwandtner to use "java Reflection" feature in order to obtain the names of all its

members from the data structure, also generate an instance of class .

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

a.	US Publication. No.	2003/0210275
b.	US Patent No.	6668284.
c.	US Publication. No	20030159130
d.	US Patent No.	6054983

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

sc
Patent Examiner.
October 30, 2006.

SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER